



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,084	08/21/2006	Gerhard Loeckle	10191/3769	1434
26646	7590	06/24/2009	EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON LLP ONE BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10004			BROADHEAD, BRIAN J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	3664			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
06/24/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/550,084	LOECKLE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BRIAN J. BROADHEAD	3664	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 7-13 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 7-13 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9-19-05, 5-13-09.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 7 through 13 are objected to because of the following informalities:
2. In claim 1, the “crash sensors inside and outside the control units” are never used. There is nothing in the claims relating the crash signal and first plausibility signal to the crash sensors.
3. In claim 7, once again, the “crash sensing means inside and outside of the control means” is never used. The rest of the claims refers to a “vehicle sensor means” and just checking a “crash signal” that has no origin claimed.
4. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Knueppel et al., 2004/0158376.
7. Knueppel et al. disclose a control unit checking a crash signal in accordance with a first plausibility signal from a sensor outside the control unit to trigger restrain devices and sensors in and outside the control unit in figure 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knueppel et al., 2004/0158376, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Breed et al., .

11. Knueppel et al. disclose the limitations as set forth above. They do not disclose the apparatus receives the first plausibility signal from a vehicle dynamics control system. at least one of the crash sensors includes a side-impact sensor, the control unit configured to check plausibility of the crash signal of the side impact sensor in accordance with the first plausibility signal from the vehicle dynamics control system; the apparatus receives the first plausibility signal from a knock control system; the

knock control system is configured to analyze a structure-borne sound signal for presence of a crash signature and to generate the first plausibility signal as a function of the crash signature; and the apparatus is configured to generate a second plausibility signal via at least one of the crash sensors and to trigger the restraint devices as a function of the crash signal and one of (a) the first plausibility signal and (b) the second plausibility signal. Breed et al. disclose the apparatus receives the first plausibility signal from a vehicle dynamics control system in paragraph 322; at least one of the crash sensors includes a side-impact sensor, the control unit configured to check plausibility of the crash signal of the side impact sensor in accordance with the first plausibility signal from the vehicle dynamics control system in paragraph 322; the apparatus receives the first plausibility signal from a knock control system in paragraph 322 and 574; the knock control system is configured to analyze a structure-borne sound signal for presence of a crash signature and to generate the first plausibility signal as a function of the crash signature in paragraph 322 and 574; and the apparatus is configured to generate a second plausibility signal via at least one of the crash sensors and to trigger the restraint devices as a function of the crash signal and one of (a) the first plausibility signal and (b) the second plausibility signal in paragraph 322 and 574. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the other systems as disclosed by Breed to detect collisions and crashes because it would remove the need to have all the remote sensors of Knueppel.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRIAN J. BROADHEAD whose telephone number is (571)272-6957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday or Tuesday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Khoi Tran can be reached on 571-272-6919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brian J. Broadhead/
Examiner, Art Unit 3664